# More on Nehru's Philosophy in the Light of the Sino-Indian Boundary Question

*by*
*The Editorial Department*
*of the* Renmin Ribao

HX
632
A1
W9
NO.1431

MAIN

*Special Supplement*
*CHINA RECONSTRUCTS*
*December 1962*

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

https://archive.org/details/moreonnehrusphil00edit

*The following is a translation of an article published in* Renmin Ribao *on October 27, 1962.*

FOR several years Nehru has obstinately rejected the Chinese government's proposals for settling the Sino-Indian boundary question peacefully through negotiations, and has moved troops to make incursion after incursion into China's territory. On October 12, 1962, haughtily disregarding the consequences, he publicly ordered Indian troops to "free" the Chinese frontiers from the Chinese troops stationed there. Soon afterwards, aggressive Indian troops launched large-scale armed attacks in the eastern and western sectors of the Sino-Indian border, thus bringing about unprecedentedly serious military clashes between China and India.

China has always hoped to avert a conflict. Though we have repeatedly exercised forbearance and self-restraint, what we least wished to see happen has come to pass. China has at no time occupied or intruded into any part of India; but the Indian side, which has occupied vast tracts of Chinese territory, has been deliberately using force to change the state of the boundary and extend its aggression. China has proposed again and again to the Indian government that negotiations be held at once without pre-conditions, but Nehru wants the Chinese troops to withdraw from large tracts of their own territory as a pre-condition for negotiations, thus rejecting negotiations without any reason whatsoever.

Even after Indian troops had intruded time and again into Chinese territory in the western and eastern sectors of the Sino-Indian border, China's frontier guards strictly

observed the People's Government's order to avoid conflict. They never fired the first shot even when, under their very eyes, they saw Indian troops occupying their territory, cutting off their links with the rear and setting up strong points for aggression only a few hundred metres, a few dozens of metres, or only a few metres away. It was in these circumstances that many of our soldiers were killed or wounded by Indian troops. The Nehru government took our forbearance and self-restraint as an indication that we are weak and can be bullied. Indian troops pressed forward steadily and penetrated deep into Chinese territory, set up more and more strong points for aggression and advance positions. After completing their dispositions for attack, the Indian troops finally launched a large-scale general offensive on October 20, 1962.

This series of facts, these recent developments in the Sino-Indian border situation, all add up to one inescapable conclusion: the present serious armed conflict is entirely due to deliberate provocations and aggression by the Nehru government.

The whole world is now closely following the Sino-Indian border incidents. It is now more than three years since the ruling circles of India, headed by Nehru, started the Sino-Indian boundary dispute. Why have they balked at a peaceful settlement and insisted on provoking China, going so far as to launch a large-scale armed attack against China? In order to lay bare the essential truth of the matter and elucidate the root cause and background of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, it is necessary to proceed from an extensive coverage of the facts and to make a comprehensive historical analysis of them.

More than three years ago, this newspaper published an article entitled "The Revolution in Tibet and Nehru's

Philosophy"* which discussed Nehru's "philosophy" in the light of intervention in China's Tibet by the Indian ruling circles. Now we propose to make a further inquiry into Nehru's "philosophy" in the light of the Sino-Indian boundary question.

## I

EXACTLY as in the case of their interference in China's Tibet, the provoking of Sino-Indian border incidents by India's ruling circles headed by Nehru, leading to their large-scale armed invasion of China, is no accident, both being determined by the class nature of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords whose interests are closely connected with those of the imperialists.

To explain this point, let us recall some history.

Readers are first invited to read the following passage written by Nehru in his book *The Discovery of India* in 1944.

> . . . though not directly a Pacific state, India will inevitably exercise an important influence there. India will also develop as the centre of economic and political activity in the Indian Ocean area, in Southeast Asia and right up to the Middle East. Her position gives an economic and strategic importance in a part of the world which is going to develop rapidly in the future. If there is a regional grouping of the countries bordering on the Indian Ocean on either side of India, — Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, India, Ceylon, Burma, Malaya, Siam, Java, etc., — present-day minority problems will disappear, or at any rate will have to be considered in an entirely different context.
>
> . . . the small national state is doomed. It may survive as a culturally autonomous area but not as an independent political unit. (Meridian Books Ltd., London, 3rd Ed., 1951, pp. 510-511.)

* See special supplement to the June 1959 issue of *China Reconstructs*.

This enables one to understand two things clearly:

First, the goal pursued by the ambitious Nehru is the establishment of a great empire unprecedented in India's history. The sphere of influence of this great empire would include a series of countries from the Middle East to Southeast Asia and far surpass that of the colonial system set up in Asia by the British empire in the past.

Secondly, the ambitious Nehru believes that when the "regional grouping" with India as "the centre of economic and political activity" is set up, or, in other words, when the great empire conceived by Nehru comes into existence, "minority problems will disappear" in this region. According to Nehru, "the small national state is doomed. It may survive as a culturally autonomous area but not as an independent political unit." In a word, it can only be a vassal in Nehru's great empire.

These remarks of Nehru's were written 18 years ago. Nehru was dreaming of a great Indian empire long before India's proclamation of independence. This is the real "discovery" made by the expansionism of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India!

These reactionary, expansionist ideas of India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords form an important part of Nehru's philosophy.

India was under the colonial rule of British imperialism for a long time. The Indian big bourgeoisie is a parasitic class fostered by British imperialism. Its close relations with the British monopoly capitalist class are clearly seen in Nehru. Nehru has said: "In my likes and dislikes I was perhaps more an Englishman than an Indian." (Michael Brecher: *Nehru, a Political Biography*, Oxford University Press, London, 1959, p. 50.) Fostered by the British imperialists, the economic forces of the Indian big bourgeoisie already began to develop under British rule.

This development was especially noticeable after World War I and during World War II. As a large country, India was regarded by British imperialism as the economic and political centre of its colonial system in the East and was called "the brightest jewel in Britain's imperial crown." This view of India held by the British imperialists was an insult to the great Indian people. However, the Indian big bourgeoisie which depended on British imperialism took over from the British imperialists this concept of India as "the centre of Asia," and this has led to Nehru's idea of a great Indian empire.

After India's proclamation of independence, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru inherited the bequests of the British colonialist rulers and have tried their best to preserve them; they have become increasingly brazen in carrying out their chauvinistic and expansionist policy. India is the only country in Asia that has a protectorate. The Indian ruling circles have used every means to interfere in the internal and external affairs of countries around India, to control their economy and trade and demand their absolute obedience. This is no secret. An article appearing recently in the Nepalese weekly *Naya Samaj* says: "Nepal has always been friendly towards India, but India on the contrary has always looked with a threatening eye on the independence of Nepal. India does not favour Nepal's survival and progress as an independent nation. It has been India's wish that Nepal should surrender to India and agree to act in accordance with Indian directions, and India is working to this end." It is not an isolated case, nor is it towards Nepal alone that the Nehru government adopts this chauvinistic and expansionist policy.

It is precisely from this expansionist viewpoint that the Indian ruling circles regard China's Tibet region as an Indian sphere of influence. In 1950, the fourth year

after India's proclamation of independence, the Nehru government interfered with the Chinese people's liberation of their own territory of Tibet; later, they instigated and backed up the treason and rebellion of the reactionary clique of the upper social strata in the Tibet region. It was from this series of concrete facts that we began to understand Nehru's expansionist "philosophy."

Nehru's policy on the Sino-Indian boundary question and the whole process by which he engineered the Sino-Indian border clashes have shed new light on the expansionist philosophy of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords.

It is a well-known fact that the Sino-Indian boundary has never been formally delimited but that there is a traditional customary line which historically was formed long ago. While it ruled India, British imperialism continuously nibbled away at China's Tibet region, and so boundary disputes constantly occurred.

After India's declaration of independence, the Indian ruling circles regarded as India's both those Chinese territories which the British imperialists had occupied and those which they had wanted to occupy but had not yet succeeded in occupying. Taking advantage of the fact that in the period soon after its founding New China had no time to attend to the Sino-Indian boundary and that China's security was seriously threatened by the U.S. imperialist war of aggression in Korea, the Indian ruling circles brazenly did what the British imperialists had not dared to do. They forcibly pushed India's northeastern boundary up to the vicinity of the so-called McMahon Line which China has never recognized, and occupied more than 90,000 square kilometres of China's territory. Subsequently they crossed the so-called McMahon Line at several points.

Again and again, the Indian authorities arbitrarily and unilaterally altered their map of the Sino-Indian boundary to incorporate large areas of Chinese territory into India. On March 22, 1959, that is, the fourth day after the reactionary clique of the upper social strata of the Tibet region started its rebellion and attacked the People's Liberation Army units in Lhasa, Nehru hastily wrote to Premier Chou En-lai, making territorial claims on China based on the map arbitrarily altered by the Indian government. He demanded that there should be incorporated into India not only the more than 90,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the eastern sector and the roughly 2,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the middle sector, but also the over 33,000 square kilometres of Chinese territory in the western sector which had always been under Chinese jurisdiction. The total area so claimed is about the size of China's Fukien province, or four times the area of Belgium or three times that of Holland.

For the past three years and more, Nehru has insisted that China should accept these preposterous demands, and has persisted in the use of force continually to invade and occupy Chinese territory. Nehru's expansionist "philosophy" boils down to this: "The places I have occupied are mine, and those I intend to occupy are mine also. Since I was able to occupy an inch of your territory yesterday, I can certainly occupy a yard of your territory today." This is downright unreasonable, not to say utterly outrageous!

The Chinese government has consistently held that, since China and India had suffered the common experience of being subjected to imperialist aggression, now that India had gained her independence and that New China had been founded, they ought to live together amicably and solve their differences through peaceful

negotiation. After the Indian side provoked border clashes in 1959, the Chinese government proposed on its own initiative that talks be held between the Prime Ministers of the two countries. In April 1960, Premier Chou En-lai visited New Delhi with the desire to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question, held talks with Indian Prime Minister Nehru and made earnest efforts to reach a preliminary agreement that would help settle the boundary question. However, there was no response from the Indian side to the sincere efforts of the Chinese side. The subsequent meeting of Chinese and Indian officials also failed to produce the results it should have done.

The Chinese government has always held that even if the two sides cannot for the time being achieve a meeting of minds on the boundary question, this should not lead to border clashes. As early as 1959, it repeatedly proposed that the armed forces of each side withdraw 20 kilometres all along the border and stop border patrols so as to disengage their armed forces and avoid clashes.

After the Indian side rejected these proposals, China unilaterally stopped patrols on its side of the border in the hope of helping to ease the border tension. The adoption of this measure by China led to some relaxation in the situation along the Sino-Indian border for a certain period. If the Indian side had agreed to the Chinese proposal for the withdrawal of 20 kilometres by each side, it would have undoubtedly been possible to avert military clashes between the armed forces of the two sides. Even when the Indian side did not agree to withdraw, these clashes would have been prevented if the Indian side had respected the unilateral Chinese cessation of patrols, instead of taking the opportunity to invade China.

Contrary to our expectations, the Nehru government, taking advantage of the unilateral cessation of patrols by the Chinese frontier guards, pressed forward steadily

all along the Sino-Indian border, penetrated deep into China's territory, built scores of aggressive strong points and continuously provoked armed clashes, first in the western and middle, and then in the eastern, sectors. It is easy for everybody to see that China has tried by every means to disengage the armed forces of the two sides along the Sino-Indian border, while the Nehru government, bent on maintaining military contact, has again and again adamantly rejected China's reasonable proposals.

Disengagement of the armed forces of the two sides would not prejudice the stand of either side on the boundary question; it is a practical and most effective method of avoiding border clashes. In the process of settling their boundary questions, both China and Burma and China and Nepal employed different means to disengage their armed forces and thus facilitated the peaceful and friendly settlement of the Sino-Burmese and Sino-Nepalese boundary questions. Why can't this method be applied to the Sino-Indian border as it was to the Sino-Burmese and Sino-Nepalese borders? For what reason has the Nehru government adamantly rejected the Chinese proposals and insisted on maintaining military contact? Does it not prove that the Nehru government is deliberately prolonging tension along the Sino-Indian border? Does it not prove that the Nehru government intends to provoke armed clashes whenever it wishes in order to attain its ulterior aims?

While pushing ahead with his policy of expansion into China, Nehru has continually used the boundary question to fan the anti-China campaign. A rough count shows that on various occasions in the past three years Nehru has made more than 300 speeches on the Sino-Indian boundary question. He used the most malicious language in attacking and vilifying China; he talked about

Chinese "incursions into Indian territory," creation of "a clear case of aggression," "aggression being added to aggression," "expansion at the cost of India," "trying to flaunt her strength in a crude and violent way," "to keep a foot on our chest," and described China as being "imperialist," "expansionist" and "aggressive," and so on and so forth.

In addition to noisily slandering China on the boundary question, Nehru has mounted a series of attacks on China in much broader terms than the boundary question; he has also tried to sow dissension between China and other countries in the most despicable and sinister way.

Witness the following statements made by Nehru:

> A strong China is normally an expansionist China. Throughout history that has been the case. [China's] population problem itself, the vast population and the pace of growth greater than almost any in the wide world . . . is likely to create a very novel and very dangerous situation not so much for India, but for India also. (November 27, 1959)

> Even if we are a hundred per cent friendly with them, the fact remains that here is a mighty power sitting on our borders. That in itself changes the whole context, the whole picture. . . . So, we face each other there and we face each other in anger at the present moment and we are going to face each other, not today or tomorrow but for hundreds and hundreds of years. (December 9, 1959)

> Basically, the truth is that China has been expansionist whenever it is strong. But the present push also comes from rapid developments inside China, in military and industrial fields. (December 12, 1959)

> A tremendous explosive situation is being created by the rapid growth, industrially, and in the population of China. (May 2, 1960)

> China is at present affected by bad harvests, which is a terrible thing considering the growing population of China. . . . The continuous failure of harvest has created an explosive situation. (May 2, 1962)

What was Nehru driving at in these utterances? Their meaning is:

(1) China should not become a strong country, but should remain a poor and weak one with an impoverished people beset with internal and external troubles, as it was under the rule of imperialism, feudalism and bureaucrat-capitalism before liberation.

(2) China should not develop its industry rapidly, but should continue to be a backward, agricultural country.

(3) China should not have the necessary military strength to consolidate its national defence, though it is faced with aggression and the threat of war by U.S. imperialism.

(4) China should not have so large a population, still less increase its population.

(5) When China develops its industry rapidly, this will create "an explosive situation"; when China is affected by bad harvests, this too will create "an explosive situation."

(6) China should not be India's neighbour but should change its geographical location.

In short, it seems to Nehru that, unless China ceases to exist or removes to some other place, China and India are bound to "face each other in anger . . . not today or tomorrow but for hundreds and hundreds of years"!

We would like to ask: whose spokesman is Nehru? Is he speaking for the Indian people? Not at all. The

Indian people, including the Indian workers, peasants, politically conscious intellectuals, oppressed national bourgeois elements and open-minded public men and women, that is, the overwhelming majority of Indians, wish to have as their neighbour a powerful, prosperous, industrialized and populous China, in which the people are the masters of the country, just as the Chinese people wish to have as their neighbour a powerful, prosperous, industrialized and populous India, in which the people are the masters of the country.

The Chinese people have achieved complete emancipation and have taken the great path of socialist construction. A socialist China is, and always will be, a peace-loving country. How is it possible that, having eliminated the social roots of exploitation and oppression of man by man at home, we should go abroad to invade and plunder others?

Our industrialization is socialist industrialization, industrialization for the well-being of all the people; besides, we have inexhaustible resources and the world's biggest domestic market. How is it possible that our industrialization should initiate a "push" for expansion?

Our army is a people's army, an army dedicated to a just cause; it regards wars of aggression as crimes. Its purpose is to safeguard the interests of the people and consolidate the national defence. How is it possible that this army should invade other countries? And how is it possible that this army should invade our neighbour India?

China is indeed a country with a large population. But why should this constitute a menace to India? As a result of the victory of the people's revolution, China's social productive forces have been completely liberated, and therefore we can solve the so-called population

problem and gradually raise the people's living standards by developing production on a large scale. Under the socialist system the problem of "overpopulation" simply does not exist. If there should be talk of a "population problem," then India is also a country with one of the biggest populations in the world. Moreover, while the density of the population of China is 67 per square kilometre, that of India is 148, more than double China's. We would like to ask Mr. Nehru: According to your logic, do you or do you not think that India's huge population is also a menace to other countries?

It is historically true that China was powerful and invaded other countries in the past, but that occurred under the rule of the feudal landlord class. China today is a people's China, a socialist China; its social system is fundamentally different and its domestic and foreign policies are fundamentally different from those of the past. A powerful and prosperous socialist China can only benefit peace and the fight against aggression, can only be of benefit to its neighbours and to friendship among nations. It will be a disadvantage only to the imperialists, who are aggressive by nature, and their lackeys. People throughout the world who love peace and uphold justice maintain this view, and they believe that the greater the power and prosperity of socialist China the better. Since Nehru so hates to see a powerful and prosperous socialist China, where does he stand? Has he not indeed put himself in the position of a lackey of the imperialists?

China has all along pursued a foreign policy of peace and stood for peaceful coexistence on the basis of the Five Principles with all countries having different social systems. China has signed treaties of friendship and mutual non-aggression or treaties of peace and friendship with the Yemen, Burma, Nepal, Afghanistan, Guinea, Cambodia, Indonesia and Ghana. Similarly, China has

always wanted to live in friendship with India. But Nehru, on the contrary, holds that India cannot live in friendship with China. This runs diametrically counter to the wishes and interests of the Indian people.

China has had boundary questions inherited from history with a number of its neighbours. For example, with Burma and Nepal too, China has very long boundaries which had not been formally delimited in the past. But on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, in the spirit of mutual understanding and mutual accommodation, and through full consultations, boundary treaties have been signed between the governments of China and Burma and between the governments of China and Nepal, which thus resulted in a reasonable and friendly settlement of the complicated questions inherited from history. Why then should it be impossible to settle the Sino-Indian boundary question? If Nehru really wanted to settle the boundary question, it should not be difficult to do so. And even if it were to remain unsolved for the time being, this should not prevent the two countries from maintaining the status quo of the boundary and living in peace with each other. And what need could there be to slander and attack China endlessly and even to cross swords with China?

Nehru has his ulterior motives for refusing to make it up on the Sino-Indian boundary question over a long period of time and for continuously creating tension. To understand this, we must examine the class nature of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords, represented by Nehru, whose interests are closely connected with those of the imperialists; we must examine the needs of the Indian reactionary ruling circles, represented by Nehru, in domestic and international politics; and we must broadly examine the background, both inside India and in regard to its international relations.

## II

EVERYBODY knows that before India attained independence, Indian society was colonial and feudal. The task facing the Indian people was to carry out a national and democratic revolution against imperialism and feudalism. The great Indian people waged a prolonged and heroic struggle for the complete overthrow of the colonial rule of British imperialism in India and for the genuine independence and liberation of their homeland. After World War II, the national liberation movements carried on by the people of the Asian and African countries rose to unprecedented heights and the anti-British struggle of the Indian people forged ahead. The Chinese people always deeply sympathized with and highly esteemed the Indian people in their national liberation struggle.

The Indian bourgeoisie has a blood relationship with the British bourgeoisie and the Indian landlord class. But in its own class interests, it participated in the Indian people's anti-British movement in varying degrees at different stages. However, because of its economic position, from the very beginning it had a strong tendency towards compromise in the anti-British movement. In the struggle for national independence, the Indian bourgeoisie carried on the non-cooperation movement against British colonial rule on the one hand, and on the other used the slogan of "non-violence" to paralyse the people's struggle and restrain their revolutionary movement.

In his *Autobiography* Nehru himself shows this characteristic of the Indian bourgeoisie. He writes that the Indian national movement "has been not a change of the social order, but political independence. . . . It is absurd to say that the leaders betray the masses because they do

not try to upset the land system or the capitalist system. They never claimed to do so."*

In the course of the Indian people's movement for national independence, the British colonialists reached a compromise with the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India and turned over their rule to the latter on conditions which basically kept the British colonialists' economic interests intact. Thus, the fruits gained by the Indian people in their anti-British struggle were seized by India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords.

After India proclaimed independence, Nehru, who once represented the interests of the Indian national bourgeoisie to a certain degree, gradually became a loyal representative of the interests of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India as the class struggle developed at home and abroad. The Nehru government has substituted reactionary nationalism for the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution, and has linked itself ever more closely with the imperialist and feudal forces. Of course, certain contradictions exist between India's big bourgeoisie and big landlords and foreign monopoly capital, whose interests are not in full conformity. Therefore, when the contradictions between imperialism and the Indian nation sharpened, the Nehru government, under the pressure of the masses of the people, showed a certain degree of difference from imperialism. But the class nature and economic status of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords determine the Nehru government's increasing dependence on and service to imperialism.

India did not gain economic independence after its proclamation of independence. Imperialism still retained its economic influence in India. Foreign capital still con-

* Jawaharlal Nehru, *Autobiography,* The Bodley Head, London, 1949, pp. 366-367.

trolled many vital branches of the country's economy. According to statistics submitted to the Indian Prime Minister by the secretariat of the Indian Cabinet in 1951, foreign capital controlled 97 per cent of India's petroleum industry, 93 per cent of the rubber industry, 90 per cent of match manufacture, 89 per cent of the jute industry, 86 per cent of the tea processing industry and 62 per cent of the coal-mining industry. Even in the cotton textile industry, which used to be called the national industry of India, 21 per cent was controlled by foreign capital. Although in the early days of independence the Indian government nationalized a few enterprises run by British capital which was paid large sums in compensation, the fundamental interests of imperialism in India were not touched.

In recent years, foreign investments in India have rapidly increased. In June 1948, foreign investments in Indian enterprises (excluding investments in banks) totalled 2,560 million rupees. This sum increased to 6,550 million rupees in 1960, that is, increased by 150 per cent within thirteen years. In 1948, foreign capital amounted to 34.8 per cent of the paid-up capital of Indian joint-stock companies. By 1960 this proportion had increased to 38 per cent.

At the same time, the number of enterprises which are jointly owned by Indian monopoly capital and foreign capital but are actually under the control of the latter has also grown rapidly. According to a report in the Indian journal *Economic Times* of July 23, 1962, such jointly owned enterprises increased by 103 in 1958, 150 in 1959, 380 in 1960 and 403 in 1961. By March 1962, the total number of such jointly owned enterprises had reached 1,240. It is the amount of U.S. capital that has increased most rapidly. From 1948 to 1959, British investments in India doubled but U.S. investments increased seven times.

From 1948 to 1960-61, the proportion of India's total imports coming from Britain decreased from 22.8 to 19.8 per cent, while the U.S. share increased from 16 to 27 per cent (not including the grains imported from the United States), with the U.S. thus overtaking Britain.

The fact that the Nehru government has become increasingly dependent on foreign aid is particularly noteworthy. Foreign aid accounted for 9.6 per cent of total expenditures under India's first "Five-Year Plan," and for 20.6 per cent under its second "Five-Year Plan"; it will account for 30 per cent under its third "Five-Year Plan." According to the October 1961 and April 1962 issues of the *Foreign Aid* of the U.S. International Co-operation Administration and other U.S. official material, the "aid" which the U.S. extended or promised to extend to India between 1949 and the end of July 1962 amounted to U.S. $4,754.2 million. If to this is added the "aid" extended to India during the same period by international financial organizations controlled by the United States, the grand total reaches U.S. $6,598.2 million.

The overwhelming proportion of the large amount of foreign aid received by the Nehru government consists of loans repayable with interest, and the annual interest rates on these loans run as high as 6 per cent. As a result, India's foreign debt burden grows heavier and heavier, and it becomes more and more difficult for India to extricate itself from its economic dependence on foreign monopoly capital. The Indian weekly *Link* wrote in its August 15, 1962 issue, ". . . instead of helping India to move ahead towards the goal of independent development, these foreign loans will for a long time remain a halter round the country's neck."

These facts prove that economically India has not freed itself from dependence on imperialism. What is

different from the past is that U.S. imperialism is gradually taking over British imperialism's monopoly position in India.

The Nehru government has established a number of state-run enterprises in India which are nothing but state-capitalist enterprises dominated by the big bourgeoisie and big landlords and actually dependent on foreign monopoly capital. Such enterprises serve the interests both of the Indian big bourgeoisie and big landlords and of foreign monopoly capital. They are in essence Indian bureaucrat monopoly capital. This bureaucrat monopoly capital is expanding. It expands at the expense of the Indian working people and even of the capitalist owners of small and medium-sized enterprises.

In 1960 Nehru openly called on the Indian people to "tighten their belts" in order to carry through his "industrial revolution." The living standards of the masses of the Indian working people have been deteriorating in recent years. Prices have been continuously mounting and taxes increasing. The number of unemployed has become ever greater, and the life of the peasantry has become increasingly hard.

India's basic domestic problem is the peasant problem.

When they ruled India, to serve their own predatory ends the British imperialists supported the feudal landlord class. The broad masses of the peasants were subjected to all kinds of exploitation in the form of rent, taxes and usury, and agricultural production was at a very low level.

After India's proclamation of independence, what policies did the Nehru government adopt in regard to the feudal land system?

In the initial period of India's independence, in order to meet the needs of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords

to concentrate power in their own hands, the Nehru government abolished the political privileges of some of the local feudal princes and the *zamindari* (tax-farming) privileges of some landlords, but the Indian feudal land system as a whole was preserved. According to the national *Sample Survey* of 1954-55 published by the Indian Ministry of Finance in 1958, land distribution in India was as follows: Poor peasants and farm labourers, comprising 75 per cent of all agricultural households, owned 17 per cent of all cultivated land; lower middle peasants, comprising 12.5 per cent, owned 16.5 per cent of the land; the better-off middle peasants, rich peasants and landlords working their own farms, comprising 8.5 per cent, owned 32.5 per cent of the land; while the feudal landlords and the more wealthy rich peasants, comprising only 4 per cent, held as much as 34 per cent of the land. As a result of large-scale evictions by feudal landlords in recent years, the concentration of landholdings has become even greater, and the ranks of the poor peasants and farm labourers have grown.

According to a survey of agricultural labour published by the Indian Ministry of Labour, in 1951-52 the number of peasant households which were in debt was 44.5 per cent of the total number of peasant households; in 1956-57 the figure had increased to 64.5 per cent. An official survey in 1960 showed that peasant indebtedness had grown to a total of 9,000 million rupees. *Yojana*, a bi-weekly published by the Indian government, admitted in its October 1, 1961 issue that there had been no improvement in the status of the rural proletarians — the landless farm labourers; in fact, if there was any change, it was a change for the worse, as prices were all rocketing up.

In view of the economic conditions mentioned above, the prestige of Nehru's Congress Party is steadily declin-

ing and dissatisfaction and opposition among the broad masses of the people are growing day by day. Big-scale strikes and struggles for land have flared up one after another. The victory won by the Indian Communist Party in Kerala in India's second general election in 1957, the struggle against hunger in West Bengal and Uttar Pradesh in 1958, the struggle against taxation launched by the Punjabi peasants in 1959, the struggle for food waged by one and a half million people in West Bengal in 1959, the great strike staged by 500,000 employees of the central government in 1960, the struggles against taxation which swept the whole country and the struggles for land in many places in 1961 and 1962 — all these are important indications of India's ever-sharpening class contradictions and social contradictions and of the deepening of the political crisis facing the Nehru government in recent years.

Nehru constantly slanders Marxism as being "out of date," and trumpets his philosophy of "tolerance," "non-violence" and "peaceful means." But the Indian realities are a great mockery of Nehru's philosophy. Nehru is indeed tolerant of imperialism and the feudal forces, but he is not "tolerant" of the people and the progressive forces, nor "non-violent" towards them. Since coming to power, Nehru has used violence to suppress the masses of the people and the progressive forces; he has become an old hand at opposing communism and the people.

According to Indian official statistics, in the three years from the date of India's independence to August 1950, Indian troops and police opened fire on the masses on as many as 1,982 occasions, killing 3,784 people, wounding 10,000 and throwing 50,000 into jail. In the past few years, there has been an increasing number of incidents in which the Nehru government used violence against the masses. Nehru openly encouraged the reactionary

forces in Kerala to use violence to overthrow the Communist-led government of Kerala in July 1959. His government has adopted large-scale measures of repression against the masses' struggles for the right to live; in the struggle for food in West Bengal in August and September 1959 alone, 80 people were killed, 3,000 wounded and more than 20,000 arrested. At the Conference of Indian Governors of States held in Delhi on November 9, 1960, Prasad, the former President of India, admitted that, in the previous thirteen years, the number of incidents in which the police had opened fire surpassed the number under British rule.

The Nehru government has used extremely brutal measures of repression against many minority nationalities in India. Available information indicates that over many years Indian troops have killed tens of thousands of the Naga people in the northeastern part of India, and detained tens of thousands more in concentration camps. Even the *Observer* of London pointed out in a recent article that the Indian government was carrying out a policy of "genocide."

Nehru wrote in his book *Glimpses of World History* in 1934 that "so long as capitalism can use the machinery of democratic institutions to hold power and keep down labour, democracy is allowed to flourish. When this is not possible, then capitalism discards democracy and adopts the open fascist method of violence and terror." (Lindsay Drummond Ltd., London, 4th Ed., 1949, p. 826.) Nehru did not then know that these words would eventually serve as an apt description of his own policy.

In view of the actual economic and political conditions in India, is not the building of a "socialist pattern of society" in India, as advertised by Nehru, an out-and-out hoax? Commenting on Nehru's "socialism," Harriman,

spokesman for the U.S. monopoly groups, said on May 4, 1959:

> I think it is a good thing that they [Nehru and his like] use this word ["socialism"]. It is a highly popular word among the Asian peoples, where capitalism has become closely identified — almost synonymous — with colonialism. The Indians [Nehru and his like] have taken it away from the Communists.

Harriman's remarks serve to show what Nehru's "socialist pattern of society" is really worth.

With any country, a given foreign policy is necessarily the continuation of a given domestic policy. Like its domestic policy, the foreign policy of the Nehru government reflects its reactionary class nature.

At one time some of the Nehru government's actions were helpful to world peace. It refused to join imperialist military blocs, turned down the imperialists' request to establish military bases in India and declared its adherence to the policy of "non-alignment." It stood for peaceful coexistence with socialist countries and joined with China in initiating the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. The Nehru government played a positive role in sponsoring the first Asian-African Conference.

However, even in that period, Nehru seldom voiced opposition to the major acts of aggression by imperialism, especially by U.S. imperialism, but constantly came out against the just struggles of the people of various countries and against the socialist countries. On many important, key international questions, Nehru invariably stood on the side of imperialism, adopting in the main a policy towards imperialism of "criticizing in a small way and helping in a big way". For instance, during the war of U.S. aggression in Korea, the Indian government put forward a proposal in the United Nations in November

1952 supporting the forcible retention of prisoners of war by the United States. During the counter-revolutionary incident in Hungary in 1956, Nehru maliciously slandered the Soviet Union and attacked the Hungarian Workers' and Peasants' Revolutionary Government.

When the U.S. and British imperialists sent troops to Lebanon and Jordan in 1958, Nehru openly spoke up for the U.S. and British aggressors, characterizing their act as "protecting their own interests." Nehru said that "he was sorry" about the death of Faisal, the common enemy of the Iraqi people. In 1958, in his article "The Basic Approach," Nehru vilified the Soviet Union for using "violence." He distorted the criticism of Yugoslav modern revisionism by the Communists of various countries as "interference in the internal affairs of other countries" and described the execution of the traitor Nagy by the Hungarian people as "contributing to world tensions."

With the changes in India's domestic situation and in the international situation in recent years, Nehru's foreign policy has leaned more markedly towards imperialism. In addition to intensifying its suppression and exploitation of the Indian people, the Nehru government has increasingly relied on imperialism as a major means of coping with the economic and political difficulties and crises in India. On the other hand, in order to counter the influence of socialism, and particularly that of China's socialist revolution and socialist construction, to obstruct the national liberation movements, and to fight for control of the intermediate zone, U.S. imperialism now attaches greater importance to the part played by Nehru. As the general crisis of capitalism deepens daily, U.S. monopoly capital is trying all the harder to penetrate India and turn it into an important market for the export of U.S. commodities and capital. As a result,

the United States in recent years has made an obvious shift in policy towards the Nehru government, from opposition to its policy of "non-alignment" to vigorous aid to it; from refusal to supply machinery and technical knowledge to the Indian big bourgeoisie to cooperation with the Indian big bourgeoisie in the joint exploitation of the Indian people. In a word, U.S. imperialism pursues a policy of paying a high price to buy over the Indian big bourgeoisie represented by Nehru.

An analysis of the figures of the "aid" granted to India by the United States and U.S.-controlled international financial organizations in the past ten years and more shows that their "aid" to India is a barometer of the foreign policy of the Nehru government, and particularly of its policy towards China. Statistics show that in the period from 1949 to the end of the first half of 1956 their "aid" to India amounted to U.S. $789.1 million, averaging U.S. $105.2 million a year. In the period from the second half of 1956 to the end of the first half of 1959, when the foreign policy of the Nehru government gradually turned to the right, their "aid" to India was U.S. $1,936.7 million, averaging U.S. $645.5 million a year. And in the period from the second half of 1959 to the end of July 1962, that is, after the Nehru government had stirred up the anti-China campaign, their "aid" to India was U.S. $3,872.4 million, or an annual average of U.S. $1,290.8 million.

It is in these circumstances that over the past few years Nehru has practically thrown away the banner of opposition to imperialism and colonialism in international affairs, adapted himself to the needs of U.S. imperialism, become a busy spokesman for U.S. imperialism, and even openly made Indian troops serve as an international policeman for U.S. imperialism in its suppression of national liberation movements.

Nehru neither supported nor sympathized with the great struggle of the Japanese people against the U.S.-Japan military alliance treaty in 1960, saying "it is not for me to discuss the issue."

After U.S. mercenaries invaded Cuba in April 1961, Nehru said that "India could not judge, nor was she in a position to judge, the international conditions of Cuba — who was right and who was wrong."

In March 1961, when Mali, the United Arab Republic, Ceylon, Indonesia, Morocco, Burma, Guinea and other Asian and African countries one after another announced the withdrawal of their troops from the Congo in protest against the use of the United Nations by imperialism for intervention in the Congo, the Nehru government, on the contrary, agreed to send a contingent of 3,000 Indian troops (afterwards increased to 6,000) as reinforcements for the "United Nations Forces" in the Congo to suppress the national liberation struggle of the Congolese people and to assist U.S. imperialism in its attempt to swallow up the Congo. The Nehru government is to some extent responsible for the fact that, after the murder of the Congolese national hero Lumumba, his successor Gizenga was imprisoned.

In September 1961 at the conference of the heads of state of the non-aligned countries, Nehru, going contrary to the opinions of the heads of many countries, held that the question of opposing imperialism and colonialism should occupy "a secondary place"; he disagreed with the adoption of "brave declarations" condemning imperialism and colonialism, and thus helped the Western countries, and especially U.S. imperialism, in a big way.

On May 29, 1961, the *U.S. News and World Report,* in an article entitled "A Close Look at the Man U.S. Is

Betting On in Asia", said that "Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, is turning out to be a top favourite of the Kennedy administration among statesmen of the world." But public opinion in Asia and Africa indicates that the role played by Nehru in international affairs has given him "a bad name." Even the *Ananda Bazar Patrika* admitted in its editorial of September 14, 1962, that the Indian government is "in an isolated position in international relations" and that "India has almost no friend in Asia." On September 22, 1962, the Indian weekly *Blitz* also said regretfully that among the Asian and African countries, "we Indians [read Nehru and his like] are becoming conservative, if not reactionary."

Thus it can be seen that the policy of "non-alignment" publicized by Nehru has obviously and increasingly become a mere façade behind which he is actually carrying out a policy of opposing the national revolutionary movements of various countries, opposing socialism, and serving imperialism.

The Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru have instigated the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, provoked China and finally launched large-scale armed attacks on China at a time when their entire home and foreign policy has become increasingly reactionary. They have done so because they persist in their expansionist policy and, by sabotaging Sino-Indian friendship and stirring up reactionary nationalist sentiment, attempt to divert the attention of the Indian people, intensify their exploitation and oppression of the people, and strike at the progressive forces. They have done so, too, because they seek to make use of the anti-China campaign to curry favour with U.S. imperialism and get more U.S. dollars. In a word, in their efforts to satisfy their own needs and meet the demands of U.S. imperialism, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru have become pawns in the international

anti-China campaign. This is the root cause and background of the Sino-Indian boundary dispute.

## III

MARXISM-LENINISM points out that bourgeois nationalism plays different historical roles under different conditions. Marxism-Leninism has always distinguished between the nationalism of the oppressed nations and the nationalism of the oppressor nations, between progressive nationalism and reactionary nationalism, and has taken different attitudes to nationalism in accordance with this distinction.

In modern times, because of their contradictions with imperialism and the feudal forces, the national bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial countries can to a certain extent take part in the revolutionary anti-imperialist and anti-feudal struggle during certain historical periods and therefore play a progressive role in history. As Lenin said: "Bourgeois nationalism . . . has an historical justification." Dr. Sun Yat-sen's policies of alliance with the Soviet Union, cooperation with the Communist Party and assistance to the workers and peasants during the period of the bourgeois national-democratic revolution in China provide an outstanding example of progressive nationalism.

But on the other hand, because of their class status, the bourgeoisie of the colonial and semi-colonial countries are inclined to compromise with imperialism and feudalism and are liable to waver in the anti-imperialist and anti-feudal revolution. One section, the big bourgeoisie, whose interests are closely connected with those of imperialism and domestic feudalism, are the reactionaries among the bourgeoisie. Under certain circumstances, they many join in the movement for national independence,

but, when the broad masses of the people have really stood up, when class struggle becomes acute, and when they are bribed by the imperialists, they will betray the revolution, suppressing the people, the Communist Party and the progressive forces at home, and selling out to imperialism and opposing the socialist countries abroad. The Chiang Kai-shek reactionaries who have been overthrown by the Chinese people furnish a particularly glaring example of this phenomenon.

Since the end of World War II, a number of newly independent countries led by bourgeois nationalists have emerged in Asia and Africa. Many nationalist states in Asia, Africa and Latin America have a common desire to oppose imperialism and colonialism and defend world peace, because they still suffer from imperialist aggression and intervention and are victims of control and plunder by the new and old colonialists. They continue to struggle against imperialism and new and old colonialism, establish and develop relations of friendship and cooperation with the socialist countries, and thus make positive contributions to world peace.

The Chinese people and the peoples of the nationalist countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have all suffered from brutal oppression and plunder by the imperialists. China is still subjected to aggression by U.S. imperialism, and its territory of Taiwan is still under the occupation of U.S. imperialism. It is only natural that the Chinese people should cherish a profound sympathy and concern for the peoples of the nationalist countries.

The basis of China's policy towards the nationalist countries is this: Firstly, the primary common task of China and of all nationalist countries is to oppose their common enemy, imperialism and colonialism, and espec-

ially U.S. imperialism. They must support one another in the struggle against imperialism and colonialism. China has consistently given active support to the struggles waged by the various nationalist states against imperialism and colonialism. Secondly, it is necessary and entirely possible to establish and develop relations of friendship and cooperation between China and these countries on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. It is necessary and fully possible to bring about a reasonable settlement of all outstanding disputes among them through friendly consultations in accordance with the Five Principles and the Bandung spirit.

Similarly, China stands firm in its desire to live in eternal friendship with India. The relations of friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples have a long history. There is no conflict of vital interests whatsoever between the peoples of our two countries. In 1954 the Chinese and Indian governments jointly initiated the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence, and Sino-Indian relations built on this basis were once good. The Chinese people, like the Indian people, cherish the memory of the years when the two countries were on friendly terms.

But even in the period when Sino-Indian relations were good, the Indian ruling circles headed by Nehru repeatedly interfered in China's Tibet and harboured expansionist designs against it, thereby revealing their policy of reactionary nationalism. Then in 1959, when the rebellion of the reactionary clique of the upper social strata of the Tibet region instigated by Nehru was defeated and Nehru's expansionist dream about Tibet was shattered, and when he took a more reactionary line in all his home and foreign policies, Nehru immediately turned against his friend, switching from professions of friendship for China to frantic hostility to China.

Nehru believes that his fickle and erratic behaviour is in keeping with his "philosophy of life." In his book *The Discovery of India* Nehru said, "Life is too complicated . . . for it to be confined within the four corners of a fixed doctrine." (Meridian Books Ltd., London, 3rd Ed., 1951, p. 16.) He also said, "It is never easy to reconcile a strict adherence to truth as one sees it, with exigencies and expediencies of life, and especially of political life." (*ibid.*, p. 421.) He held that to take expediency as a criterion of action was "the universal rule" in politics.

In a word, his expressions of friendship for you at a certain time conform to his philosophy; his ambition to face you in anger "for hundreds and hundreds of years" conforms to his philosophy; and his intention to get rid of you also conforms to his philosophy. This is the sort of "philosophy" Nehru has used in guiding his reactionary policy. Both his reactionary policy and erratic behaviour serve the interests of the big bourgeoisie and big landlords of India and, in Nehru's own words, are to bring them "rich dividends".

What stand should Marxist-Leninists take on this policy of reactionary nationalism followed by Nehru?

Here a review of an episode in Chinese history which occurred more than thirty years ago may be useful.

The Chinese people still remember that when the Soviet Union was the only socialist state in the world it was provoked and attacked by China's reactionary big bourgeoisie and big landlords represented by Chiang Kai-shek. At that time, despite the fact that the Soviet government had given vigorous support to the Kuomintang of China, the Kuomintang reactionaries headed by Chiang Kai-shek, immediately after their betrayal of the revolution and their surrender to imperialism, whipped

up a frantic anti-Soviet campaign simultaneously with their unbridled anti-Communist, anti-popular moves. In December 1927, the Kuomintang reactionaries forcibly and outrageously closed down Soviet consulates in various cities of China, arrested and killed Soviet diplomatic officials and broke off diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. A year and more afterwards, in violation of the "Sino-Soviet Agreements of 1924," the Kuomintang reactionaries manufactured the "Chinese Eastern Railway Incident" in July 1929 and arrested more than 300 Soviet nationals.

Although the Soviet Union repeatedly showed forbearance and proposed the holding of a meeting to settle the Chinese Eastern Railway question peacefully, Chiang Kai-shek took the self-restraint of the Soviet Union to mean that "the Soviet Union meekly submits, not daring to make the slightest resistance." In October of that year the army of the Kuomintang reactionaries attacked the Soviet border, stirring up an armed conflict between China and the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet Union was compelled to act in self-defence and defeated this military provocation of the Kuomintang reactionaries.

Did the socialist Soviet Union do the right thing at the time? History has long since rendered its verdict: What the Soviet Union did was perfectly right. The Soviet Union's resolute counter-blow to the military provocation of the Kuomintang reactionaries not only defended the interests of the socialist state but also accorded with the interests of the Chinese people and of the revolutionary people of the world.

Sino-Indian relations today bear certain similarities to Sino-Soviet relations more than thirty years ago.

The principles of China's foreign policy and of its policy towards India have been consistent. Despite in-

cessant provocation by the Nehru government, China has continued to maintain an attitude of maximum restraint. It was only when the Nehru government recently launched large-scale attacks that China was compelled to hit back in self-defence to safeguard its sovereignty and territorial integrity and to repulse the attacks of the Indian reactionaries. It is fully necessary and perfectly just for China to do so, and it is the least a sovereign state should do. It is precisely for this reason that China has won the sympathy and support of the people of the world who cherish peace and uphold justice.

After the Nehru government started the Sino-Indian boundary dispute, the Yugoslav modern revisionists, renegades to Marxism-Leninism and lackeys of the imperialists, openly shielded and supported the outrageous anti-China policy of the Nehru government in utter disregard of the truth about the Sino-Indian boundary question. On the Sino-Indian boundary question, Tito and his ilk have always hurled shameless slanders against China and echoed the imperialists and the Indian reactionaries. Moreover, Tito said that the Soviet Union should play a "pacifying" role in relation to China on the Sino-Indian boundary question. Does the Tito clique think that when a socialist country is invaded by the bourgeois reactionaries of a foreign country, another socialist country should stand by the bourgeois reactionaries and play a "pacifying" role in relation to the invaded socialist country? By this fallacious reasoning the Tito clique has further exposed itself as a group of renegades betraying socialism, hating socialist China and sowing dissension among the socialist countries.

Marxism-Leninism always points to the fact that bourgeois nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two different world outlooks which represent two different classes and are fundamentally antagonistic to

each other. While supporting progressive bourgeois nationalism, Communists must draw a clear-cut line between themselves and bourgeois nationalism and must combat reactionary bourgeois nationalism.

More than thirty years ago, when the Kuomintang reactionaries launched their anti-Soviet campaign, the Chinese Communists were not caught in the toils of the reactionary nationalism of the big bourgeoisie. The Chinese Communists and progressives strongly protested against the anti-Soviet crime of the Kuomintang government. The Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party issued a declaration on December 24, 1927, in which it solemnly stated:

> The reactionary Kuomintang government absolutely does not represent revolutionary China and its orders to sever diplomatic relations with Russia absolutely do not represent the public opinion of the great majority of the Chinese people. The reactionary Kuomintang government regards the Soviet Union as an enemy, but we, the masses of the people, still regard the Soviet Union as a good friend of China and will always unite with it in fighting for the Chinese revolution and the world revolution.

Soong Ching Ling, leader of the revolutionaries in the Kuomintang, also sent a cable to the Kuomintang authorities at that time denouncing them as "criminals ruining the party and the nation." After the reactionary Kuomintang clique launched the anti-Soviet war in northeast China in July 1929, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party issued another declaration, resolutely calling on "the broad masses to rise against the war on the Soviet Union." In response to this call, the Chinese Communists and the broad masses of the people, despite ruthless repression and persecution by the Kuomintang reactionaries, courageously held mass meetings and demonstrations in resolute opposition to the anti-Soviet military provocation of the reactionary Kuomintang

clique. For this, many Communists, workers, peasants, students and progressives gloriously laid down their lives. Well done! Did the Chinese Communist Party do the right thing in resolutely opposing the Kuomintang reactionaries and supporting the socialist Soviet Union? Undoubtedly yes.

It was none other than the Chinese Communists who thoroughly exposed the false propaganda of narrow nationalism fanned by the Kuomintang reactionaries in their anti-Soviet campaign. It was none other than the Chinese Communists who upheld the truth and resolutely safeguarded the friendship between the Chinese and Soviet peoples under extremely difficult conditions. To this very day we feel proud that under such adverse conditions the Chinese Communists proved themselves genuinely loyal to the interests of the Chinese people and to the principle of proletarian internationalism by their deeds during that incident.

Today, the Communists and progressives of India are in a situation somewhat similar to that of the Communists and progressives of China more than thirty years ago. As a result of the reactionary policy of the Nehru government, the Communist Party and progressive forces of India are subjected to persecution. Each time the Nehru government stirs up an anti-China campaign, he simultaneously mounts an attack on the Communist Party and progressive forces of India. But large numbers of Indian Communists and progressives, large numbers of politically conscious workers, peasants, intellectuals and fair-minded people have not been deceived by the reactionary propaganda of the Indian ruling circles, and have not knuckled under to their attacks. In the interests of the Indian people, they have, under extremely difficult conditions, stood firm for truth, justice and Sino-Indian friendship and waged unflinching struggles. History will

prove that it is they who really represent the interests of the great Indian nation and people.

No matter how clamorous the anti-China hullabaloo stirred up by the Indian reactionary clique and its supporters both at home and abroad may sound for a time, the just voice of the Indian people cannot be drowned. Here we should like to give as an example a letter to the editor of the Calcutta paper *Epoch*, published on May 16, 1962. An ordinary Indian wrote:

> . . . If China has become an aggressor by occupying 12,000 square miles according to the Indian map, India also has become a greater aggressor by occupying 38,000 square miles according to the Chinese map. It would not be justified to hope that the other party would throw his map into the waste-paper basket and draw his boundary exactly according to our map. . . .
>
> The most unfortunate aspect of the India-China boundary problem is that this has today become a weapon to fulfil political objects, not only delaying its solution, but possibly also leading the internal politics of the country onto an evil path by maintaining the problem. As a result of the second general elections [1957] there was an increase in strength of the left-wing forces and an Indian state went to the Communists. Since then we have been experiencing a gradually increasing trend of the Government towards the right. A considerable time before the appearance of the boundary problem Nehru called China undemocratic because China had solved its unemployment problem and made comparatively rapid progress. Later, warm praise of land reform in China by the Malaviya Commission sent by the Government naturally alarmed the domestic feudal elements. Finally when the industrial goods of China became a hindrance to the Indian industrialists in reaping high profits on the east and west markets, it was almost to be presumed that relations would be aggravated on any pretext.
>
> After that the boundary problem came along as a boon. It was not only that an opportunity was found to

distort everything concerning China, but an easy path was opened for censuring the gradually increasing progressive movements in the country. Within a very short period the boundary problem was first turned into border penetration and afterwards border aggression. Since then we have been experiencing its application everywhere — in the interim elections of Kerala, in food movements of West Bengal, in the strikes of government employees, and finally in the third general elections [1962]. Probably many people still remember that during the food movement the walls of Calcutta were covered with posters "Don't make any movement, China is deploying her forces on the border with a view to conducting aggression!" This propagated Chinese aggression is one of the main reasons of the rise of the utter rightist force today in central and northern India after the third general elections. . . .

The issue becomes most clear when we study the newer reports of Chinese penetration. Nowadays, in most cases, these new posts are either not found afterwards, or even if they are detected, it is found afterwards that they were a few yards within Chinese territory [Nehru's speech in Rajya Sabha about Chinese "aggression" just on the eve of the election]. Or, it is found that the report is published in bold type on the first day and after two days it is published in small type that the report is "officially unconfirmed."

If China were expansionist how could she settle her boundary disputes with Nepal and Burma? Now it is prohibited even to raise these questions. It is being openly announced from all sides that not to call China an aggressor is treachery to the country. . . . But what are we, the ordinary Indian people, getting from this? Probably we shall get a little more U.S. aid from the budget to secure "democracy" in the East. But what next? What will be our answer to history? Peoples of newly awakened Asia and Africa from the Yangtse-Euphrates to the Nile-Congo have been advancing today at tremendous speed. Shall we be able to participate in the procession of peace and friendship by drowning this bitter cry from the past in the current of new life?

This Indian reader is but one among the millions of Indian people. How clearly he sees through Nehru's trick of deliberately using the boundary question to whip up the anti-China campaign! And how ardent is his hope that the Indian people will remain friends with and march alongside the other peoples of Asia and Africa!

It is quite obvious that the Indian people are clear-sighted. No deceit on Nehru's part can fool the broad masses of the Indian people.

But it is surprising that in India some self-styled Marxist-Leninists such as S.A. Dange, should trail closely behind Nehru and falsely accuse China of "encroachment" on Indian territory, alleging that "China has committed a breach of faith," that one must "support the Indian government," etc. How far have these so-called "Marxist-Leninists" lagged behind the ordinary Indian people in their understanding! How far have they departed from the interests of the Indian people, from the basic principles of Marxism-Leninism and from proletarian internationalism!

The Chinese people are absolutely not opposed to India, nor are the Indian people opposed to China. It is the common wish and interest of the people of China and India that they should respect each other, live together in friendship, and unite and cooperate with each other. How India should solve its economic and political problems is entirely the Indian people's own affair, and China has never interfered.

In this article we have touched upon certain aspects of the Indian situation in order to elucidate the truth, but we have never rejoiced over the difficulties facing the Indian people. On the contrary, we note with profound concern that since the Nehru government has

ignored the sufferings of the Indian people, aggravated the tension on the Sino-Indian border and extended the armed clashes, the Indian people will have to shoulder heavy military burdens in addition to the exorbitant taxes already weighing down on them. Indian soldiers are being used as pawns by the selfish ruling circles and are making meaningless sacrifices in the border clashes, while India's big capitalists and big landlords are taking the opportunity to feather their own nests. The Chinese people have the greatest sympathy for the broad masses of India's working people who are facing such sufferings. The Chinese people sincerely hope that the Indian people will free themselves from this lot, that India will soon become prosperous and strong, and that the Indian people will be able to lead a happy life. We hope to see a progressive, democratic and strong India on the continent of Asia.

We are firmly convinced that all the complicated questions between China and India inherited from history can be settled, provided friendly negotiations are conducted in accordance with the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Like the Sino-Burmese and Sino-Nepalese boundary questions, the Sino-Indian boundary question can be settled in a friendly way through peaceful negotiations. The Chinese people have never wavered in this conviction. We are willing to do everything possible and, together with the Indian people and all countries and people concerned with Asian peace and Afro-Asian solidarity, continue to work for the cessation of the border clashes, for the reopening of peaceful negotiations and for the settlement of the Sino-Indian boundary question. The Nehru government should make corresponding efforts on its part if it still has any respect for India's national interests and for the aspirations of the Indian people, and if it does not want to bruise its head against a stone wall

by further expanding the border clashes to the advantage of the imperialists.

Safeguarding and strengthening the friendship between the Chinese and Indian peoples not only accords with the common interests of the 1,100 million people of the two countries but also conforms to the common wish of the peace-loving people in Asia and throughout the world. No force can undermine or shake this great friendship. Nor can the clashes provoked by the Indian reactionary circles on the Sino-Indian border in any way undermine or shake the true friendship between the people of China and India. It can be said that those individuals, whether inside or outside India, who have whipped up anti-China campaigns in an attempt to sabotage Sino-Indian friendship can never gain anything from it; they will only expose their reactionary features and meet with utter defeat.

May the Himalaya and Karakoram Mountains bear witness to the great friendship between the peoples of China and India! Though beclouded for the time being, Sino-Indian friendship which dates back to the immemorial past, will tower for ever like the Himalayas and the Karakorams.

HX 632 A1 W9 no.1431
World communism in the 20th century.

0172047A MAIN